EVALUATION SURVEY OF ISRAEL PARTICIPANTS IN THE AID TRAINING PROGRAM

sponsored by the

Technical Assistance Department of the
Prime Minister's Office

and the

United States Agency for
International Development

THE ISRAEL INSTITUTE OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Jerusalem, June 1962

EVALUATION SURVEY OF ISRAEL PARTICIPANTS IN THE AID TRAINING PROGRAM

sponsored by the

Technical Assistance Department of the
Prime Minister's Office

and the

United States Agency for
International Development

UZI PELED

THE ISRAEL INSTITUTE OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Jerusalem, June 1962

SUMMARY*

Introduction and Procedures

1. This survey sought to obtain a comprehensive picture of the U.S. AID training program from the point of view of Israeli participants and their supervisors.

2. 569 participants were interviewed who had been sent on the training program since 1951 and had returned to Israel by April 1, 1960. In addition, 200 supervisors were interviewed, who were responsible for a total of 258 participants. Seven U.S. AID technicians were also interviewed.

Characteristics of Participants

3. The modal participant was: male (94%); married (87.5%); 30-49 years old (71%); considerably (over 5 years) experienced in his field of specialization (67.3%); in a second or third ranking position (50.4%); in a supervisory position; at least partly university-trained (63.2%); employed by government (64.8%).

---

*At appropriate places throughout this report we have summarized preceding sections; for the convenience of the reader we have concentrated these summaries to allow a rapid review of the main findings.

Utilization of Training

4. It can be concluded that the training program has had its effect on the work of the participants subsequent to their return.

5. A sizable number (18.6%) have moved to a higher level of position. Most (83.4%) returned to their pre-training jobs, but only a minority (47.2%) were still on these jobs at the time of the interview.

6. A great majority (95%) felt that they were effectively using their newly acquired skills, most of them considerably so. Almost half (46%) also felt that they were transmitting to their colleagues at least "quite a bit". Their supervisors concurred in this view.

Satisfaction with Training

7. Most participants (81%) and most supervisors (95%) found the level of the training program satisfactory. 62% of the participants said that the training program as a whole was "very satisfactory", and 66% that it was a "most important thing". Nevertheless, 741 changes were proposed by 359 participants, with a plurality being changes in program emphasis.

8. The supervisors overwhelmingly felt that the investment had been most worthwhile, though a large minority proposed that some or all of the training should be in Europe or small countries.

9. The greater the degree of satisfaction with and the higher the evaluation of the training program, the greater is the utilization of new skills and knowledge acquired.

10 The factors which seem to have played a role in leading participants to select the "very satisfactory" response to the question "What factors are related to general satisfaction with training?" are:

- satisfaction with the training program before going abroad
- finding program level "about right"
- program arranged in detail on arrival abroad
- guidance from the program manager
- balanced scope of activities
- year left for training (1951-55)
- age of participants (50 or more)
- organized social activities
- spending over a year in training
- field of specialization (health and sanitation)

11. The factors which seem to have played a role in leading participants to be satisfied with the level of training are:

- more than two years in field of specialization
- taking part in the planning of the program
- non-attendance at a non-university special program
- receiving pre-departure information about the level of training

Non-Technical Aspects of Training

12. Only 15% of the participants had language difficulty.

13. More than half (54%) (excluding ministry employees) did not receive any pre-departure information at their place of work.

14. 79% were entertained in private homes in the country of training.

15. A small minority (13%) took part in a seminar on communications at the end of the training program.

16. 29% of the participants became members of a U.S. professional society after their return.

Administrative Practices and Procedures

17. A great majority (88%) of the participants were invited or selected for training. Only 22% believed that their personal connections had been an important factor in the decision to select them.

18. 47% were well satisfied with the training program before going abroad.

19. Only 12% of the supervisors were familiar with the various aspects of training before participants left.

20. Most participants (82%) received enough attention from their program managers.

21. Program changes were made in respect to 30% of the participants, in most cases at their own request.

22. 36% indicated that the money AID made available to them was too little.

23. Two-thirds had at least some contact with U.S. AID after their return.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	i
List of Tables	ix
I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	
1. Description of the Participants' Program in Israel and Historical Development of the Training Program	1
2. Purposes of the Survey and General Description of Procedures Used	4
II. SURVEY FINDINGS	
1. Characteristics of Participants	6
2. Utilization of Training	12
a. Job shifts	12
b. Level of jobs	14
c. Number of subordinates	16
d. Are participants effectively utilizing their training?	16
e. Are participants transmitting to others their newly-acquired knowledge and skills	18
3. Satisfaction with Training	19
a. Level of program	19
b. Training program	21
c. Changes in training program suggested by participants	24

(Continued)

Table of Contents (cont.)

d. Supervisors' views on training program 25

e. Satisfaction and utilization 27

f. Factors related to general satisfaction with training 29

g. Factors related to satisfaction with level of training 34

4. Non-Technical Aspects of Training 36

a. English language instruction 36

b. Pre-departure information 36

c. Orientation in the country of training 40

d. Community participation and hospitality 40

e. Seminar in communications 41

f. Membership in professional societies 41

5. Administrative Practices and Procedures 42

a. Selection 42

b. Pre-departure planning of program 43

c. Program manager 44

d. Program changes made while participant was in country of training 44

e. Finances 45

f. Post-training contact with U.S. AID 46

(Continued)

Table of Contents (cont.)

III. APPENDICES

1. Detailed Description of Procedures Used 48
   a. Study population 48
   b. Translating 48
   c. Pretest 50
   d. Interviewing 50
   e. Coding 53
   f. Machine processing 55

2. Tables 55

LIST OF TABLES

Text Tables

A. Comparison of Participants' Levels of Position at Time of Selection and at Time of Interview 15

B. Participants' Reasons for Thinking the Training Program Was a "Most Important Thing" 23

C. Changes Suggested by Participants 25

D. Supervisors' Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Training Program 27

E. Participants' Views on Amount of Money Made Available by AID, in Relation to Pre-departure Information about Use of Money 46

Appendix Tables

1. Year Left for Training by Type of Employer 56

2. Age by Level of Position 57

3. Satisfaction with Training by "What Would Current Job Have Been Without Training Program" 58

4. Participants' and Supervisors' Estimates of Relevance of Training to Present Job 59

5. Participants' and Supervisors' Estimates of Transmission of New Skills to Others 60

6. Utilization Score by Major Field of Activity 61

7. Utilization Score by Total Time in Field of Specialization 62

8. Utilization Score by Level of Position at Time of Selection 63

9. Utilization Score by Receipt of Degree or Diploma 64

10. Utilization Score by Importance of Training as Seen by Supervisor 65

I - INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Description of the participants' program in Israel and historical development of the training program[1]

The U.S. Technical Assistance Program in Israel began with the arrival of the U.S. AID Mission in December of 1951. The technical assistance aspect of the total aid program had as one of its objectives the transfer of technical skills and knowledge through training. The Participant Training program in Israel has been the element in technical assistance that concerned itself with the development of the most valuable resources of a nation - human resources. No matter how richly otherwise endowed, a nation can progress only as rapidly as its human resources will permit.

Israel can hardly be considered a country richly endowed with natural resources. This relative lack of natural endowment, however, has been more than counter-balanced by the quality of her human resources. It has been Israel's good fortune to have been endowed with an intelligent, energetic people fired with the desire to build an economically viable nation. It is largely for this reason that the

---

1. This section was written by Mr. Henry Chalfant, Acting Director, U.S. AID/Israel.

Participant Training Program in Israel has been so successful. The high quality of the trained Israeli is further attested to by the fact that Israel is now and has been in recent years transferring these acquired skills and knowledge to less fortunate people through a technical assistance program of her own.

The Participant Training Program in Israel will terminate with the closing of the U.S. AID Mission in June of this year. It will terminate just as it began some ten years ago - by mutual agreement of the two governments. Mutuality has been the keynote of Israel's training program. Decisions as to types of training needed, and timing of that training have been joint decisions reached after careful consideration and consultation by representatives of the two governments.

In terms of the total technical assistance program, the dollar value of the Participant Training element has been modest - approximately $1.5 million or 10% of a $15 million total

Upon termination of the Technical Assistance Program some 640 Israeli participants will have received training in the U.S. and third countries for varying periods of time.

An estimate of the impact of the training program cannot, however, be measured merely in terms of the number of participants trained abroad. The "multiplier effect" of this exchange

of knowledge and skills would considerably enlarge the transfer pattern. Israelis selected for training abroad were carefully chosen with a view of their returning to Israel as disseminators of skills and knowledge to others. This "multiplier effect" is an essential element of any program of technical assistance and, because of the aptitude and intellect of Israel's human resources, has made a significant contribution to the success of the training program in Israel.

Over the span of the last ten years training has been provided in one form or another and with varying degrees of emphasis to all major sectors of the Israeli economy. Initially, emphasis was placed on training assistance in the fields of agriculture and water resources with lesser sums of money programmed for training in industry and mining, education, health and sanitation, and public administration. Each successive year the progress of the economy and continuing needs were examined anew by the joint U.S.-Israel planning team, and based upon their mutual judgment, new training programs were devised. As the first priority requirements were met and as the Israeli economy progressed, emphasis shifted toward the industrial sector. As the level of technical assistance became increasingly sophisticated the size of the training programs was adjusted accordingly. Finally in November of 1960, the U.S. and the Israel Governments decided the Technical Assistance Program in Israel had achieved

its objectives and could be concluded. After working out an orderly phase-out plan, the two governments decided on June 30, 1962 as the termination date.

2. Purposes of the survey and general description of procedures used

a. Purposes

(1) To investigate the efficienoy of the training program as seen by the participants from Israel;

(2) to ascertain to what extent participants benefit from the training program;

(3) to investigate to what extent participants and their supervisors are satisfied with the training program;

(4) to classify participants according to various demographic data.

Ordinarily, a survey of this sort can be very useful in planning for the future. However, since it has been decided by both the U.S. and Israel governments to terminate the U.S. AID program in Israel by June 30, 1962, we have omitted specific consideration of recommendations for the future of the program. From the discussions of various weaknesses and strengths, which are raised throughout the report, we believe that much that is applicable to other programs can be inferred.

This report summarizes the essentials of the myriad details found in the punch cards, which have been filed with AID, Washington.

b. General procedures

Surveys of returned participants are being conducted in many countries simultaneously. The overall survey is directed by AID, Washington, which prepared the questionnaires, instructions and code books.

The Israel Institute of Applied Social Research was responsible for:

(1) interviewing of participants, supervisors and U.S. AID technicians;
(2) coding of the material;
(3) punching and control punching of IBM cards;
(4) writing of the final report.

The data in the punchcards which have been transmitted to AID, Washington, will be incorporated in the report on the whole project.

For all precise details on the methodological aspects of each phase of the study, the reader is referred to Chapter III.

II - SURVEY FINDINGS

1. Characteristics of participants interviewed (2)

a. Sex

94% of the participants were men.

b. Marital status

87.5% of the participants were married; 8.1% were single. No information was available on the remaining 16 people.

c. Age (At time of departure for training)

10%	of the participants were under 30 years of age
38	were between 30 and 39 years of age
33	were between 40 and 49 years of age
18	were 50 years of age, or more
1	- not ascertained
100%	

A plurality of the participants belonged to age group 35-39 (19.5%). Taking men and women separately, the plurality of male participants were in this age group (35-39),

---

(2) Unless otherwise noted, all data in this section refer to the time participants were selected for training abroad. The percentages are based upon completed, usable interviews with 369 participants.

whereas the plurality of the 22 female participants were in age group 40-44 (about 33% of all the women). In general it can be said that over 70% of all the participants were between the ages 30-49 at the time of their departure for training.

d. Total time in field of specialization

From the following figures, it is obvious that, in general, candidates who were selected for the training program had previous experience in their field of specialization.

67.3%	of the participants had over five years previous experience
20.8	had from one to less than five years previous experience
4.9	had less than one year previous experience
0.8	three participants were sent without any previous experience
6.2	not ascertained
100.0%	

e. Level of position

The majority of the participants can be classified as holding second and third level positions. Only two participants were "top policy makers," the highest rank in the position scale.

The following is the percentage distribution of participants by level of position. The figures in parenthesis indicate the rank number in the position scale.

38.5% - Subordinate management - line or staff (3)
17.3 - Professional occupations (5)[3]
16.0 - Engineers (4)[3]
11.9 - Policy makers - second level (2)
5.7 - Supervisors, inspectors, foremen (7)
10.6 - all others
100.0 %

Interestingly, 60% of the women were in the third rank; most of the remaining 40% were in the fifth and sixth ranks.

f. Number of people supervised

It is not sufficiently clear why 45.3% of the participants did not respond to this question. We assume that owing to the considerable span of time that had elapsed from the time they went on the training program until the interview, they did not remember the exact number of persons they had been in charge of at the time. Alternately, it may be that many of them had not occupied supervisory

---

(3) Ranks (4) and (5) are approximately on the same level of training and authority.

positions, and hence were reluctant to answer the question. Considering those who did respond to this question, it appears that almost no one was sent on the training program who had not been in charge of others. This is an indirect indication of the comparatively high level of the participants, and suggests the significance of the "multiplier effect" concept.

Number of people supervised	
1 - 5	10.8%
6 - 19	16.8
20 - 49	8.7
50 - 199	10.3
200 - 499	4.6
500 and more	3.0
none	0.5
not ascertained	45.3
	100.0%

g. Total years of education

People without formal education or with incomplete elementary education were not sent on the training program. 63.2% of the participants had completed at least one year of university studies. From the replies to another item, it also seems that another 5.9% (included in the secondary school category here) had registered at a university but not completed their first year. 21.1% of the participants,

moreover, had received additional training at special schools (e.g., management training).

The percentage distribution of participants by years of education at the time of selection is as follows:

Years of education	%
No formal education	-
1 - 4 years	-
5 - 8 years	0.8
9 - 12 years (secondary)	17.0
13 - 16 years (university)	45.0
17 years or more(post-graduate)	18.2
not ascertained	19.0
	100.0%

These data also point to the high level of the participants, compared with that of the rest of the population.

h. Type of employer

The majority of participants (about 65%) were government employees at the time of selection; only 14% were employed in private enterprise.

Type of employer

Government	64.8%
Private business	13.8
Profession	3.0
Trade union	3.0
Student	0.3
Nationalized industry	-
Not classifiable above	14.8
Not ascertained	0.3
	100.0%

SUMMARY: The modal participant was:

male (94%)
married (87.5%)
30-49 years old (71%)
considerably (over 5 years) experienced in his field of specialization (67.3%)
in a second or third ranking position (50.4%)
in a supervisory position
at least partly university-trained (63.2%)
employed by government (64.8%)

2. Utilization of training

One way of analyzing the extent to which training presumably had an impact on the participants can be inferred from the replies to questions on the level of position occupied, number of subordinates, and job shifts. Alternately, light is shed on this question by the more subjective responses of the participants. These are considered in the following sections.

a. Job shifts

The participants' questionnaire included a series of questions about their positions before the training, their first jobs immediately after their return, and their present positions (at the time of the interview). To the question: "Was the first job you had after you returned from the training program the same as the job you had before you left?" the following responses were received:

83.4% - the same job
16.3 - a differnt job
0.3 - did not get a job (one participant)
100.0%

We tried to investigate whether a participant's returning to the same job or to a different job was related to his offering himself as a candidate for the training program,

or his being selected or invited by others. It transpired that this had no influence whatsoever on whether a participant did or did not return to the same job.

To the question: "Is your present position the same as the one you had when you first returned?" the following responses were received:

47.2% - the same job
49.0 - a different job
3.8 - not working (retired, etc.)
100.0%

It is interesting to note that the majority (67%) of the group of those who had a "different job" right after their return had again a different job at the time of the interview. This suggests that these participants in general tend to go from job to job, whatever the reason may be. At the same time, only 48% of those who had returned to their old jobs were working in different jobs at the time of the interview.

To the question: "Suppose you had not gone on this training program. What kind of job do you think you would now have?" the following responses were received:

61.3% thought they would have about the same job

16.0 thought they would not have obtained such a good job without the training program

4.4 thought that through going on the training program they lost their jobs which otherwise they could have held

13 - don't know

4.1 had no job, so the question was not relevant

0.8 - not ascertained.

100.0%

With respect to the above responses, no significant difference was found between the participants selected for the training program by their supervisors and the others.

b. Level of jobs

76.5% had the same level of position at the time of the interview as at the time of selection

18.6 had a higher level of position

4.9 had a lower level of position

00.0%

The higher the level of position at the time of selection, the greater was the probability that the participant return to a position of the same level after the training program. On the other hand, the training did help a considerable number of people on a lower level to progress and achieve

higher positions. Thus, of the 150 participants originally on the five lowest levels (4-8) only one occupied a lower level of position at the time of the interview, while 33% had moved to a higher level. This is seen in the following table:

Table A

Comparison of Participants' Levels of Position at Time of Selection and at Time of Interview (x)

Level of position at time of interview / Level of position at time of selection	Higher level		Same level		Lower level		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	62	18.6	255	76.5	16	4.9	333	100.0
1 - Top policy makers	-	-	1	(50)	1	(50)	2	0.6
2 - Policy makers, second level	2	4	39	89	3	7	44	13.2
3 - Subordinate management	10	7	113	85	11	8	134	40.2
4 - Engineers	11	19	45	79	1	2	57	17.1
5 - Professional occupations	23	38	40	62	-	-	63	19.0
6 - Sub-professional occupations	3	(33)	6	(66)	-	-	9	2.7
7 - Supervisors, inspectors, foremen	10	50	10	50	-	-	20	6.0
8 - Artisans, craftsmen	3	(75)	1	(25)	-	-	4	1.2

(x) Does not include occupations not elsewhere classified, inactive and not ascertained - total 36 participants.

Of the 62 participants who improved their level of position after the training, 66% were promoted to subordinate management positions (3); 24% to policy makers, second level positions (2); and 5% reached top policy makers level (1). The remaining 5% went up to (5) and (7).

c. Number of subordinates

The number of subordinates under one's direction is not a necessary indication of the rank one holds. Thus a man previously in charge of an eight-man unit who has been promoted, now may have only two subordinates, i.e., two unit managers. Moreover, given the relatively small number of workers in Israeli organizations, the category in the coding scheme often probably obscured changes in this respect.

Comparing the number of subordinates under a participant at the time he was selected for training with that in his present position, we found that the overwhelming number of participants did not move from one category to another in this respect.

d. Are participants effectively utilizing their training?

In order to answer this question comprehensively, it would be necessary to have the responses of the U.S.AID technicians who took care of the participants after they

had returned from their training program. These were not obtained,[4] and we will therefore have to deal with this question on the basis of the participants' and supervisors'[5] responses only.

It is said that participants maintain that they do not make much use of the material learned in the course of the training program. This view is refuted by the fact that the great majority of the participants - about 95% - who were working at the time of the interview, replied to this question in the positive, namely, that they were able to use at least part of the skills and knowledge they had learned on the program.

It is important to note that more than three-quarters of those who replied positively to the question about utilizing "any of the skills and knowledge they learned on the program" selected the "almost everything, everything" or "quite a bit" answers. Only 24% replied that they were using "some" or "only a little" of the material learned.

---

(4) When the U.S. AID technicians were to be interviewed in November 1961, it transpired that only seven of them had remained in the country, and only 11 participants included in this survey had been taken care of by them.

(5) 200 supervisors were interviewed, covering 258 participants. 61 participants had no supervisors, and the supervisors of 41 others were not interviewed for various reasons (abroad, refusals, etc.).

Moreover, 41% of the participants still have plans for utilizing in the future the knowledge and skills which for various reasons they have been unable to use thus far.

e. Are participants transmitting to others their newly-acquired knowledge and skills?

Over 96% of the participants maintained that they were able to convey to others at least some of what they had learned on the program. To be more precise, 50% were able to transmit to others "only a little" or "some" of the study material, 46% were able to convey "quite a bit" or "almost everything, everything".

In order to verify the reliability of these replies, we asked the respective supervisors a similar question, namely, whether the participants in their charge were conveying the study material to others. Here again, 86% replied positively; 8% of the supervisors had no information in this respect; and 6% claimed that the participants in their charge were not conveying the study material to others.

Considering the fact that the data received from supervisors concern 70% of the participants, it appears that the replies of the supervisors to the question under review corraborate the replies we received from the participants on the same question.

SUMMARY: It seems reasonable to conclude that the training program has had its effects on the work of the participants subsequent to their return. A sizable number (18.6%) have moved to a higher level of position. Most (83.4%) returned to their pre-training jobs, but only a minority (47.2%) were still on these jobs at the time of the interview.

A great majority (95%) felt that they were effectively using their newly acquired skills, most of them considerably so. Almost half (46%) also felt that they were transmitting to their colleagues at least "quite a bit." Their supervisors concurred in this view.

3. Satisfaction with training

To what extent is there satisfaction with the training program? This was analyzed with respect to four aspects: participants' satisfaction with the level of the program; their satisfaction with the program as a whole; changes suggested by the participants; and supervisors' views.

a. Level of program

The level of the program was found to be suitable for participants from this country. Most participants (81%)

thought that it was "about right"; 14% thought it was "too simple," and only2% thought it was "too advanced," in spite of the fact that 72% of the participants had no knowledge whatsoever about the level of the program before they left for their training.

We investigated whether knowledge of the program level before departure had an influence on the way participants responded to the question: "How did you find the level of your program?" We found that those who did know about the level of the program in advance tended to find it "about right" (89%) more so than did those who had no prior knowledge (79%). Thus, there exists a positive relation between prior knowledge of the level of the program and satisfaction with it.

Furthermore, participants were asked directly whether knowledge in advance of the program level was helpful, and the replies confirm the above assumption: 60% of the participants thought it would have been helpful if they had been told about the level of the program in advance.

In the second part of the supervisors' questionnaire, they were asked to express an opinion about the training program in general, without reference to the particular training program of the participants in their charge. 95% replied that the level of the program was satisfactory.

b. Training program

The great majority of participants were satisfied with the training program as a whole. The detailed distribution is as follows:

62% - very satisfactory
34 - moderately satisfactory
4 - not too satisfactory
100%

Only one participant said about the training program that it was "not satisfactory at all."

66% of the participants thought the training program was a "most important thing." 2% replied that it was a waste of time as far as they were concerned. 32% gave intermediate replies.

Cross tabulation of the two questions: "How satisfactory was that training program?" and "How important was your program?" confirmed the hypothesis that of those who thought that the training program was a "most important thing" substantially more also found the program "very satisfactory" than of those who chose the "in-between" response (71% vs. 44%).

What led participants to think that the training program was "a most important thing"? We investigated this question, using four general categories to classify the responses to this open-ended question, as follows:

(A) non-specific, personal gain, e.g., "training gave me broader insight; now see matters from different angle."(6)

(B) Specific, personal gain, e.g., "it gave me self-confidence, courage, confirmed my convictions, etc."

(C) Non-specific, impersonal gain, e.g., "it was useful to my employer or country."

(D) Specific, impersonal gain, e.g., "I acquired knowledge and ideas and observed systems, methods which were new and applicable in solving problems in my country."

---

(6) This and the following examples in each category are the most frequent answers given.

The distribution of replies is shown in the following table:

Table B

Participants' Reasons for Thinking the Training Program Was a "Most Important Thing"

Category of the reason	First reason listed	
	N	%
Total	234	100
A. Non-specific, personal gain	63	27
B. Specific, personal gain	13	5
C. Non-specific, impersonal gain	70	30
D. Specific, impersonal gain	37	16
E. Other (reasons not covered by the above categories)	44	19
F. No reason given	7	3

The most frequent type of reason given is C - non-specific, impersonal gain. 30% of the participants gave a reason in this category first. It is followed by A, D and B, in that order.

Participants who felt that "training was a waste of time" were also asked to explain their attitude. Since only four such replies were received, it was impossible to investigate

this further. At any rate, three out of the four did not sufficiently explain their reasons, and one replied: "training was not appropriate to my needs."

c. Changes in training program suggested by participants

Although 96% of the participants were satisfied to a greater or lesser extent with the training program, a multitude of responses was received to our question: "If you were to go through that program again, what changes would you like to have made in it? Why?"

The changes thus suggested were classified in three categories:

(1) Changes in emphasis, e.g., more or longer training[7]
(2) Changes in type, e.g., more practical work
(3) Changes in arrangement, e.g., better planning and organization.

The 359 participants who responded gave a total of 741 suggested changes. The distribution was as follows:

---

(7) See previous footnote.

Table C

Changes Suggested by Participants

Category of changes	All changes		First change	
	N	%	N	%
Total	741	100	359	100
in emphasis	202	28	114	32
in type	143	19	79	22
in arrangement	156	21	87	24
other	188	25	27	7.5
no changes	52	7	52	14.5

It can be seen that changes in emphasis of the training program was the leading category, considering either all the changes proposed or only the first listed by each participant.

d. Supervisors' views on training program

Most supervisors (84%) felt that the training program was worth the cost and difficulty it involved for themselves or their organization. Only 1% of the supervisors did not think the training of the participant in his charge had been worth the cost and trouble. 15% of the supervisors did not express an opinion in this respect due to lack of information or lack of memory.

About 80% of the supervisors thought that the training of the participants in their charge suited the purposes of the employer.

56% of the supervisors would not want to make any changes in the training program, in the event they were to send another participant on a similar training program. The remaining 44% would introduce the following changes:

18% - with respect to content of program
4 - with respect to length of program
2 - with respect to program planning
18 - other changes
2 - would not send additional participants.

83% of the supervisors thought that the training of the participant in his charge was essential and very important; 15% thought it was helpful, but not very important; only 2% claimed the training was not useful.

The supervisors were also requested to express their views on various subjects in connection with the U.S.AID training program, without reference to the particular participants in their charge. The following responses were received:

Table D

Supervisors' Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Training Program
(in percent)

Subject	Total	Satis-factory	Unsatis-factory
a. Procedures by which participants are selected	100	88.7	11.3
b. Subject matter covered in training program	100	85.6	14.4
c. Length of program	100	78.5	21.5
d. Country or countries of training	100	56.2	43.8
e. Practical experience provided in the program	100	78.4	21.6

The above data show that supervisors are generally satisfied with these subjects, except for the country of training. 64.4% of the supervisors who were not satisfied with this item thought that some or all of the training should be in Europe, and 11% thought that some or all of the training should be in small countries.

e. Satisfaction and utilization

Each participant received a "utilization score" based on his replies to the following six items, considered earlier:

(1) employed since return to Israel
(2) use of new skills and knowledge at current job
(3) extensive use of such skills
(4) their transmission to others
(5) extensive transmission of such skills
(6) plans to utilize them in the future.

On the basis of the assigned scores (for detailed explanation of the scoring system, see code book), participants were divided into three groups: (1) the more positive (75+); (2) the less positive (50-74); and (3) those who failed to answer one or more of the items. There were no participants in the 26-49 or 25 or lower score categories.

Comparison of the first two groups on satisfaction and evaluation of the training program showed that there is indeed a relationship: of the first group, 72% were "very satisfied," compared to 55% of the second; 77% of the first group felt that the program was a "very important thing," compared to 58% of the second.

SUMMARY: Most participants (81%) and most supervisors (95%) found the level of the training program satisfactory. 62% of the participants said that the training program as a whole was "very satisfactory," and 66% that it

was "a most important thing". Nevertheless, 741 changes were proposed by 359 participants, with a plurality being changes in program emphasis. The supervisors overwhelmingly felt that the investment had been most worthwhile though a large minority proposed that some or all of the training should be in European or small countries. The greater the degree of satisfaction with and the higher the evaluation of the training program, the greater is the utilization of new skills and knowledge acquired.

f. Factors related to general satisfaction with training

In the previous chapter it has already been noted that 96% of the participants were satisfied with the training program. In order to ascertain the factors that made for satisfaction with training, we divided the group that had expressed satisfaction with the training into two categories: (1) those who found the training very satisfactory (62%), and those who found it moderately satisfactory (34%). A series of variables were then cross-tabulated with the degree of satisfaction. Ten factors were found to have some bearing on the extent to which participants were satisfied with their program. These are listed below in the general rank order of association:

(1) Satisfaction with the training program before going abroad: of those who had been "well satisfied" before going abroad, 73% were "very satisfied" with the training program in general, compared to only 34% of those who had been "not well satisfied"

(2) Level of program: of those (6%) who found the level "too simple", only 23% were "very satisfied," while 68% of the "level about right" group were "very satisfied."

(3) Program arranged in detail when participant arrived: it could be seen that participants whose program was planned in complete detail were "very satisfied (69%) with their training. On the other hand, participants whose program was planned in partial detail tended also to consider it "very satisfactory" but in a smaller percentage (50%).

(4) Guidance and attention received by participants from the program managers made for greater satisfaction with training (two-thirds of these participants). Participants who did not receive such guidance and attention were less satisfied: only one-third among them found the training "very satisfactory".

(5) Scope of activities: participants who claimed that they had to do and see too many things in the course of training,

as well as participants who were interested in more activities than the program provided for, tended to describe training as "moderately satisfactory" (48%). On the other hand, there is a strong correlation between great satisfaction and saying "all right as it was" with respect to the scope of activities: only 23% of these said "moderately satisfactory", while almost all other said "very satisfactory".

(6) The year participants left for training had some influence on satisfaction with training. The earliest group (1951-55) were most highly satisfied: 74% of them were "very satisfied". Following them was the latest group (1959-60), of whom 64% were "very satisfied", while of the 1956-58 group 48% were in this category.

(7) Age at time of departure for training: the small group of participants (18% of all participants) who were 50 years of age or more were more concentrated in the "very satisfactory" category (81%) than the younger participants, of whom 58% said "very satisfactory". There were no differences between the sub-groups of the under-50 group.

(8) Social activities: participants for whom no social activities had been organized tended - although not too strikingly - to describe the training as "very satisfactory" less often than those for whom such activities had been planned: 53% vs. 66%.

(9) Time spent in training: only 5.4% of the participants had spent over a year in training. This group was highly satisfied: 85% said "very satisfied". A majority (62%) - albeit smaller of those who spent less time were also "very satisfied"

(10) The major field of activity in which training was given: of the participants who received training in "health and sanitation", 82% were "very satisfied". All other groups had a lower proportion of "very satisfied", the highest being 67% of the "public administration" group. The only group of whom a majority (61%) replied "moderately satisfied" was the "direct military support" group. This was, however, a very small group, containing 4.9% of the participants.

The variables listed below were found not to have any relation with satisfaction with training:

(1) Level of position at time of selection
(2) Total years of education at time of selection
(3) Opportunity to take part in planning the program
(4) Attending a general orientation session and considering the time spent there valuable
(5) Observation tour during the program
(6) On-the-job training during the program
(7) Attending a university during the program
(8) Attending a special program not at a university during the program

(9) Receiving a degree or diploma during the program

(10) Length of the program

(11) Following the program as it was originally planned

(12) Free time for personal interests during the program

(13) Entertaining in private homes

(14) Attending a seminar in communication at the end of training

(15) Marital status

SUMMARY: The factors which seem to have played a role in leading participants to select the "very satisfactory" response to the question "What factors are related to general satisfaction with training?" are:

- satisfaction with the training program before going abroad
- finding program level "about right"
- program arranged in detail on arrival abroad
- guidance from the program manager
- balanced scope of activities
- years left for training (1951-55)
- age of participants (50 or more)
- organized social activities
- spending over a year in training
- field of specialization (health and sanitation)

g. Factors related to satisfaction with level of training

As noted above, 81% of the participants found the level of program "about right", 14% claimed it was too simple, and 2% claimed it was too advanced. (3% of the responses were not ascertained.)

Here, too, a series of variables were cross-tabulated in order to ascertain which factors led to satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the level of program. The findings are as follows:

(1) Total time in field of specialization (at time of selection): of those who had spent less than two years in their field of specialization, 65% found the level of program "about right", while those who had spent more than two years tended more to find it "about right" (82%). 85% of the participants had had more than two years experience in their field of specialization.

(2) Opportunity to take part in the planning of the program: 84% of the participants who took part in the planning of their program considered it "about right", as against 76% of those who did not take part in the planning. 71% of the participants took part in the planning of their program.

(3) Participation in non-university special programs: those who attended special programs outside a university tended to be less satisfied with the level of the training than the other participants. Thus, 71% of the former, as against 83% of the latter, thought the level was "about right". 80% of the participants did not attend these special programs.

(4) Information about level of training before departure: participants who had been informed about the level of training in advance found it appropriate (88%), while others who had not been informed found it "about right" (79%). 71% of the participants did not know anything about the level of training before going abroad.

The following variables were found to be unrelated to satisfaction:

(1) Age
(2) On-the-job training
(3) Attending a university during the program

SUMMARY: The factors which seem to have played a role in leading participants to be satisfied with the level of training are:

- more than two years in field of specialization
- taking part in the planning of the program
- non-attendance at a non-university special program
- receiving pre-departure information about the level of training

4. Non-technical aspects of training

a. English language instruction

98% of the participants had to know English for the purpose of the training program. (91.9% of the participants were trained in the U.S. and another 1.4% in the United Kingdom.) Only 8% received special preparatory training in English before leaving for the program, yet only 15% experienced language difficulties during training. 7% of these 15% had difficulties in making themselves understood; 5% had difficulties in understanding others; and 3% had difficulties both ways.

b. Pre-departure information

The following is the distribution of participants by receipt of pre-departure information about the training program and the source of such information:

15.5% - received information from both sponsoring ministry and from employer

7.0 - ministry employees who received information from ministry

10.6 - received information from ministry but not from employer

19.8 - received information from employer but not from ministry

7.3 - ministry employees who did not receive information

35.7 - did not receive information from either ministry or emp-

4.1 - not ascertained

100.0%

Thus, 54% of the participants did not receive any information whatsoever from anyone at their place of work with respect to the training program while it was being planned. 63% did not receive information about the program, while it was being planned, from the sponsoring Israel government ministry which financed it. Hence, it transpires that participants (excluding ministry employees) who did not receive information about the program from the ministry also did not receive information about it from their employers (65%), while 46% received such information from their employers but not from the ministry.

Each participant was asked whether he had received sufficient information before he left for training about:

(1) what he would be learning
(2) where he would be going
(3) when he would be going
(4) the length of his program
(5) other aspects of the program

29%	answered positively to all five questions
26	answered positively to four
21	answered positively to three
18	answered positively to two
5	answered positively only to one
1	answered negatively to all five questions
100%	

No correlation was found between participants' knowing about these aspects of the program and their education. Naturally, participants who had received information from their employers about their training program, while it was being planned, knew more about these five aspects. The same applies to participants who had received such information from the sponsoring ministry. In other words: information about training program rendered to participants by the

ministry or by their employers before their departure, generally contains information with respect to the above-mentioned aspects of the program.

Participants were then asked whether, in addition to information about the program, they had received information about how to get along in the country of training. The specific items referred to were:

(1) how to use restaurants and public facilities
(2) colloquial speech and idioms
(3) religious practices
(4) use of their money
(5) manners and customs generally

33% replied positively to all five questions
18 replied positively to four
10 replied positively to three
10 replied positively to two
12 replied positively only to one
17 replied negatively to all five questions
100%

We see that while only 1% of the participants had received no pre-departure information about the training program itself, 17% had no information about the country of training (as measured by the two five-item groups).

c. Orientation in the country of training

77% of the participants attended general orientation sessions that took more than an entire day. Of these, 99% attended such sessions at the Washington International Center (WIC), Washington, D.C. These sessions were considered valuable by 87.5% of those who had attended them.

A slight correlation was found between participants' appreciation of these sessions and education. The more educated they were, the more did they tend to consider these sessions valuable: 96% of those participants who had 17 years of education, or more, considered these sessions valuable, as against 89% of the 13-16 years-of-education group, and 84% of the 9-12 years-of-education group.

d. Community participation and hospitality

67%	of the participants thought that the training program had left them sufficient time for personal interests
29	thought it had left them too little time for personal interests
4	thought it had left them too much time for personal interests
100%	

79% of the participants had been entertained in homes of private citizens in the country of training. Of these, 88% liked these visits very much. On the other hand, 35% of the participants complained that not enough social activities had been organized for them.

e. Seminar in communications

Only 13% of the participants took part in a seminar in communications at the end of their training. The function of such seminars, led by communication specialists and psychologists, is to acquaint the participant with the problems and techniques relevant to the transmission of what he has learned to others. One such seminar was organized by Michigan State University, and another by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, with 4% and 6.4% of the participants attending each seminar respectively. Since so few participants took part in the seminar, we did not analyze what they liked or disliked there, nor to what extent they use it in their current jobs.

f. Membership in professional societies

29% of the participants became members of a U.S. professional society during training, or thereafter. 30% of the participants were still members of such a society at

the time of the interview. A much greater percentage (78%) received U.S. professional publications at the time of the interview. 74% of these considered these publications "very useful"; 22% thought they were "somewhat useful"; 3% thought they were "only a little useful", and only 1% did not find them useful at all.

SUMMARY: Only 15% of the participants experienced language difficulty during training. More than half (54%) (excluding ministry employees) did not receive any pre-departure information at their place of work. 79% were entertained in private homes. A small minority (13%) took part in a seminar on communications. 29% of the participants became members of a U.S. professional society.

5. Administrative practices and procedures

a. Selection

Most participants (88%) had been invited or selected for training: 65% by their supervisors; 14% by government offices; and 4% by U.S. AID personnel; the rest (very small percentages) by labor unions, a special board, or university officials.

12% had applied for training on their own. 33% of these had heard about the training program from colleagues, and another 20% knew about it through their supervisors.

Over 90% of the participants felt that their personal abilities, the needs of the job, and their professional and educational qualifications had been important factors in the decision to select them for training. 78% pointed out that their knowledge of English had been a most important factor in this connection.

Participants refuted the contention that their personal connections had been helpful in the decision to select them for training. Only 22% believed that their personal connections had been an important factor in this connection. Interestingly, the older they were, the more did they tend to consider personal connections to have had an influence on the decision to select them for training.

b. Pre-departure planning of program

Almost half (47%) of the participants were well satisfied with the training program before going abroad. Only 12% were not satisfied. 73% of the participants had the opportunity to take some part in the planning of their training program, and of these, 87% pointed out that they were satisfied with their part in the planning. 71% of those participants

who did not have the opportunity to take part in the planning felt that it would have been helpful if they would have taken part in it. Almost half (48%) of the participants said that most of their program was based on their own ideas. An additional 42% indicated that the program was planned according to their ideas, jointly with others'.

94% of the supervisors who had been in charge of the participants even before they went abroad, had recommended them for training. Only 12% of the supervisors had been familiar with the various aspects of the program before participants left for training.

c. Program manager

Most participants (82%) received sufficient attention from their program managers. Only 8% complained about the lack of attention on the part of the program managers. 35% of the program managers were AID staff members, and 46% were staff members of other U.S. government agencies.

d. Program changes made while participant was in country of training

Program changes were made with respect to 30% of the participants. In most cases (80%), the changes were made in accordance with the request of the participants themselves.

Most of the changes related to one of the following two aspects:

(1) change in location of training; visit at one place rather than another; study at a different institution, etc. (31%)

(2) change of subject studied, or addition to subjects studied (25%)

Most participants (91%) whose program had been changed felt that this had been necessary. They gave two main reasons for this:

(1) to make the program more suited to their work and needs of their country (47%)

(2) to learn more, make the program more interesting 38%)

Almost all participants (97%) completed their training program.

e. Finances

36% stated that the money at their disposal was too little. As could be expected, participants who had been advised about finances in advance showed a greater tendency

to consider the amount of money at their disposal "about right" (67%), than did those who had not received such information in advance (52%).

Table E

Participants' Views on Amount of Money Made Available by AID, in Relation to Pre-Departure Information about Use of Money (in percent)

What is your opinion of the money AID made available to you		Total	too little	about right	more than needed
Before you left home, did you get enough information about the use of their money?	Yes	100	32	68	(-)
	No	100	46	54	-

No relation was found between participants' views on the amount of money and the different types of training (practical training, training at a university, etc.).

f. Post-training contact with U.S.AID

Two-thirds of the participants had some contact with U.S.AID at the time of the interview. 34% of them worked for U.S.AID or in a joint project with U.S.AID.

42% of the participants said that U.S.AID technicians were available for them whenever necessary. Of these:

29% had frequent contact with the U.S.AID technician
49 had occasional contact with him
23 never met him
100%

36% of the participants claimed that U.S.AID technicians were not available for them. A considerable percentage (22%) did not even know that they could avail themselves of the services of U.S.AID technicians.

SUMMARY: A great majority (88%) of the participants were invited or selected for training. Only 22% believed that their personal connections had been an important factor in the decision to select them. 47% were well satisfied with the training program before going abroad. Only 12% of the supervisors were familiar with the various aspects of training before participants left. Most participants (82%) received enough attention from their program managers. Program changes were made in respect to 30% of the participants, in most cases (four out of five) at their own request. 36% indicated that the money was too little. Two-thirds had at least some contact with U.S. AID after their return.

III - APPENDICES

1. Detailed Description of Procedures Used

a. Study population

From July to October 1960, two Institute workers filled in the participants' data sheet, using the material which was available in the AID/Israel files. Altogether, 432 such data sheets were completed. In accordance with the Sampling Guidelines Annex 6 instruction "Sampling should not be done when the total number of returned participants eligible for the study is less than 500", we did not take a sample but interviewed all participants who had returned from the training abroad at least half a year before the data sheets had to be completed. All in all, 369 participants were interviewed who had been sent on the AID training program since 1951 and had returned to Israel by April 1, 1960. In addition, 200 supervisors were interviewed. These supervisors were responsible for a total of 258 participants. Seven U.S.AID technicians were also interviewed.

b. Translating

All questionnaires and material relevant to the survey were translated from English into Hebrew. The trans-

lation of the questionnaire was recommended by the Institute and decided upon jointly with the Director of the Technical Assistance Department of the Prime Minister's Office for two reasons:

(1) We were not sure whether all the participants knew English well enough so that on-the-spot translation into Hebrew by interviewers of terms or whole questions could be avoided.
(2) It was difficult to get a large number of interviewers who knew English well.

In order to keep translation errors down to a minimum, the following measures were taken:

(1) A professional translator, well-experienced in translating social research questionnaires, translated all the questionnaires from English into Hebrew.
(2) The translated Hebrew questionnaire was re-translated into English by a different translator, likewise fluent in both languages and experienced in the translation of such questionnaires.
(3) The project director then met with each of the two translators separately in order to discuss the two translated versions, and to improve and correct the Hebrew version. The project director met again with both translators,

and the final version of the Hebrew questionnaire was decided upon. We are glad to point out that there were only minor discrepancies between the two translations.

The questionnaires were translated exactly in the same order as in the original version.

The material in connection with the coding was not translated. (See section e).

c. Pretest

Ten participants were interviewed in May, 1960. They were selected from among 30 names supplied by AID, so as to represent the different employment sectors. The questionnaire used in the pretest was an exact Hebrew translation of the first English questionnaire for participants. Seven of the participants' supervisors were also interviewed. All the material in connection with the pretest was submitted (in English translation) to AID on June 21, 1960.

d. Interviewing

The field work was conducted by 20 interviewers, divided into four teams, from March to October 1961. Each team was responsible to a local supervisor, who was in constant contact with the center in Jerusalem. The largest team, con-

sisting of 10 field workers, worked in the Tel Aviv area; four interviewers were busy in Haifa (the main city in the north of the country) and four in Jerusalem. Two field workers went out to remote places and to places where only one or two participants had to be interviewed. These were directly responsible to the center in Jerusalem. The least educated among the interviewers had full secondary education. Many of them were Hebrew University social science students. Most of them had previously done interviewing for the Institute; others had gained interviewing experience somewhere else. Those responsible for the teams were the Institute's permanent regional supervisors, who received two days training and guidance with respect to all the various aspects of the project. All interviewers were directly trained for their task, and a special study day was held for this purpose in the Jerusalem center. On this occasion, the interviewers also received instructions in writing.

The project director accompanied each regional supervisor on his own first interview. The regional supervisors, in turn, accompanied each interviewer on his first interview. Since all interviews were carried out properly, none of the interviewers had to be dismissed, and they all carried on to the end. From time to time, the regional supervisors and the project director accompanied the field workers on their

interviews in order to keep them on their toes. Participants on the highest position level, "top policy makers", were interviewed by the project director. Second level policy makers were interviewed by the project director or a regional supervisor.

All interviews with participants and their supervisors were, of course, conducted in Hebrew, and the interviewers never encountered difficulties with regard to language. The interviews with the seven AID technicians were conducted in English.

The average interview with participants took 75 minutes, with supervisors 25 minutes.

The interviewers made every effort to locate and interview all the participants and supervisors. Almost no refusals were met with. Apparently, the letter which was sent to the participants in advance had had its effect. With regard to supervisors, there were some cases where it was just impossible to interview them, particularly these who had been in charge of several participants and who were top level officials with little time to spare. But with respect to these supervisors, too, strenuous, and partly successful, efforts were made virtually till the day the field work was completed.

The following lists show the results of the field work:

Participants	
Total number contacted	432
Interviewed	369
Abroad	15
Deceased	8
Interviewed in pre-test	10
Unknown	21
Others	9

Supervisors

Completed interviews covering	- 258 participants
No supervisor	- 61 participants
Refused to have supervisor interviewed	- 4 participants
Supervisor abroad	- 5 participants
Refusals, persistent delays*	- 41 participants

* Mostly a relatively small number of supervisors who occupied top-level positions

e. Coding

Six people were engaged to code the material. All six coders knew both English and Hebrew perfectly. They were

all students close to their B.A. Four of them had done coding at the Institute previously, two had been Institute interviewers. They all received special training for the coding of the Participants' Survey.

For reasons of efficiency, coding was planned as follows: each coder coded one punchcard. Thus, he coded only one-sixth of the participant questionnaire. This made for rapid familiarity with the work, for uniform coding of the same questions throughout all the questionnaires, and for considerable time-saving. After all the six coders had completed a certain part of the work, they interchanged the punchcards for control coding. For example, the coder who had just completed punchcard 01, control-coded 02, and so on. Each coder recoded the first 50 questionnaires. The two parallel coding sheets - of the first coder and the control-coder - were then referred to the project director for examination. In case any difference appeared in the coding, each case was re-examined. Since no serious discrepancies were found, the control coder coded a sample of the remaining 319 cases: he controlled every fifth case from beginning to end. Later, two of the six coders did the coding of cards 10 and 12 (supervisors) in a similar fashion.

f. Machine processing

The punching, control punching and sorting of all the cards was done by the Jerusalem Branch of IBM (Israel). For this purpose, the following machines were used:

(1) Sorter 083
(2) Reproducer 519
(3) Collator 077
(4) Electronic statistical machine 101
(5) Tabulator 420
(6) Punch machine 024
(7) Verifier 056

2. Tables

It would be manifestly impossible to present all or the tabular material - marginal distributions and cross-tabulations - which resulted from the 146 items in the participant questionnaire and the 25 items in the two-part supervisor questionnaire. These were punched in about 575 columns of IBM cards. In the text we have presented the more central findings. We thought it worthwhile to present some further material here which seems of interest, though it is not fully dealt with in the text. All of the analyzed study material covering all marginals and about

220 cross-tabulations is on file with the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research.

Table 1

Year Left for Training by Type of Employer
(in percent)

Type of Employer at time of Selection	Year Participant Left for Training Program				
	N	Total	1951 - 55	1956 - 58	1959 - 60
Total	369	100	49	35	16
Government	239	100	55	31	14
Private business	51	100	43	41	16
Profession	11	100	27	45	28
Trade union	11	100	9	63	28
Student	1	(100)	(100)	-	-
Nationalized industry	-	-	-	-	-
Other - not included above *	55	100	44	38	18
Not ascertained	1	(100)	-	(100)	-

*Most of these refer to corporations in which the government holds a significant part of the shares, and to cooperatives.

Table 2

Age by Level of Position
(in percent)

Level of Position at Time of Selection	N	Age in Years at Time of Departure for Training: Total	Under 25	25 - 29	30 - 34	35 - 39	40 - 44	45 - 49	50 - 54	55 +	Not ascertained
Total	369	100.0	1.1	8.9	18.4	19.5	17.1	15.7	12.2	6.0	1.1
Top policy makers (1)	2	100.0	-	-	(50.0)	-	-	-	(50.0)	-	-
Policy makers - Second Level (2)	44	100.-	-	4.5	11.4	13.6	18.2	27.3	13.6	6.8	4.5
Subordinate management Line or Staff (3)	142	100.0	0.7	6.3	19.0	23.9	19.7	12.7	12.0	5.6	-
Engineers (4)	59	100.0	1.7	13.6	23.7	11.8	15.3	11.8	16.9	5.0	-
Professional occupations (5)	64	100.0	1.6	10.9	17.2	26.6	12.5	14.1	9.4	6.3	1.6
Sub-professional occupations (6)	9	100.0	-	-	(33.3)	(22.2)	-	(33.3)	(11.1)	-	-
Supervisors, inspectors, foremen (7)	21	100.0	-	9.5	14.0	9.5	23.8	19.0	9.5	9.5	4.8
Artisans; craftsmen (8)	4	100.0	-	-	(25.0)	(25.0)	(50.0)	-	-	-	-
Occupations not elsewhere classified	2	100.0	-	(50.0)	-	-	(50.0)	-	-	-	-
Inactive	3	100.0	-	-	-	(33.3)	(33.3)	-	-	(33.3)	-
Not ascertained	19	100.0	5.3	21.1	15.8	10.5	5.3	26.3	10.5	5.3	-

Table 3

Satisfaction with Training by "What Would Current Job Have Been Without Training Program (in percent)

Suppose You Had Not Gone on This Training Program. What Kind of Job do You Think You would Now Have?	How Satisfactory Was That Training Program					
	N	Total	v.s.	m.s.	not too s.	not at all s.
Total	367*	100	62.1	34.1	3.5	0.3
About the same	225	100	59.1	36.4	4.0	0.4
Better	16	100	75.0	25.0	-	-
Not as good	59	100	72.9	22.0	5.1	-
Don't know	49	100	59.2	38.8	2.0	-
Not employed at time of interview	15	100	60.0	40.0	-	-
Not ascertained	3	100	(66.6)	(33.3)	-	-

v.s. - very satisfactory
m.s. - moderately satisfactory

* Excluding two participants with different questionnaires

Table 4

Participants' and Supervisors' Estimates of Relevance of Training to Present Job (in percent)

Suppose You had not Gone on this Training Program, what Kind of Job do you Think You would have now? *	As a Qualification for his Present Job, How important was Training Program? **						
	N	Total	Not useful	Helpful but not very important	Very important	essential	other***
Total	258	100	1.9	13.6	61.4	19.0	3.9
About the same	226	100	2.0	13.4	67.1	13.4	4.0
Better	11	100	-	45.5	18.2	33.4	-
Not as good	49	100	-	14.3	51.0	30.6	4.1
Don't know	41	100	2.4	2.4	68.3	22.0	4.8
Not employed at time of interview	6	100	-	(33.3)	(66.7)	-	-
Not ascertained	2	100	(50.0)	-	-	(50.0)	-

* Participant questionnaire
** supervisor questionnaire
*** including don't know, don't remember, not ascertained

Table 5

Participants' and Supervisors' Estimates of Transmission of New Skills to Others (in percent)

Have You Been Able to Convey Any of What You Learned in the Program to Others? *	Has Any of the Information Acquired on his Program Been Conveyed to Others? **				
	N	Total	Yes	No	Don't know or don't remember
Total	258	100.0	86.8	5.4	7.8
Yes	246	100.0	87.4	5.3	7.3
No	7	100.0	(85.7)	-	(14.3)
Not ascertained	5	100.0	(60.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)

* participant questionnaire

* supervisor questionnaire

Table 6

Utilization Score by Major Field of Activity
(in percent)

Major Field of Activity in which Training Was Given	Utilization Score*				
	N	Total	50-74	75 +	No total score
Total	357	100.0	44.7	42.0	13.4
Direct military support	18	100.0	61.1	22.2	16.6
Agriculture and natural resources	86	100.0	46.5	44.2	9.3
Industry and mining	126	100.0	48.4	36.5	15.1
Transportation	25	100.0	20.0	60.0	20.0
Labor	4	100.0	(100.0)	-	-
Health and sanitation	28	100.0	32.1	64.3	3.5
Education	19	100.0	31.6	57.9	10.5
Public administration	43	100.0	39.5	37.2	23.3
Community development, social welfare and housing	4	100.0	(75.0)	(25.0)	-
General and miscellaneous	14	100.0	57.1	35.7	7.1

* For utilization score see page 27, section (e)

Table 7

Utilization Score by Total Time in Field of Specialization (in percent)

Total Time in Field of Specialization at time of Selection	Utilization Score				
	N	Total	50-74	75+	No total score
Total	367	100.0	44.7	42.0	13.4
10 years or more	152	100.0	43.4	43.4	13.2
5 to just under 10	95	100.0	40.0	46.3	13.7
2 to just under 5	63	100.0	55.6	31.7	12.7
1 to just under 2	13	100.0	38.5	46.2	15.4
Less than one year	18	100.0	50.0	38.9	11.1
None	3	100.0	(66.7)	-	(33.3)
Not ascertained	23	100.0	39.1	47.8	13.0

Table 8

Utilization Score by Level of Position at Time of Selection (in percent)

Level of Position at Time of Selection	Utilization Score				
	N	Total	50-74	75+	No total score
Total	367	100.0	44.6	42.0	13.4
Policy makers - Second level (2)	43	100.0	53.5	32.0	16.3
Subordinate management Line or staff (3)	142	100.0	42.3	43.6	14.1
Engineers (4)	58	100.0	48.2	39.7	12.1
Professional occupations (5)	64	100.0	40.6	46.9	12.5
All others	60	100.0	45.0	43.3	11.7

Table 9

Utilization Score by Receipt of Degree or Diploma
(in percent)

Did You Receive A Degree or Diploma?	Utilization Score				
	N	Total	50-74	75+	No total score
Total	367	100.0	44.7	42.0	13.3
Received an academic degree	71	100.0	47.9	38.0	14.1
Received a certificate or other non-academic citation	76	100.0	32.9	56.6	10.5
Received nothing	2	100.0	-	(100.0)	-
Did not attend a university	216	100.0	48.1	37.5	14.4
Not ascertained	2	100.0	(50.0)	(50.0)	-

Table 10

Utilization Score by Importance of Training As Seen by Supervisor (in percent)

How Important Was (Participant's) Training? *	Utilization Score**			
	N	Total	50-74	57+	No total score
Total	258	100.0	45.8	44.9	9.3
Essential	49	100.0	38.8	59.2	2.0
Very important	159	100.0	45.3	42.8	11.9
Helpful but not very important	35	100.0	54.3	37.1	8.6
Not useful	5	100.0	(40.0)	(60.0)	-
Don't know or don't remember	3	100.0	(66.7)	-	(33.3)
Not ascertained	7	100.0	(57.1)	(42.9)	-

* Supervisor questionnaire

** Participant questionnaire

IA
374.013
I8S

MEMORANDUM OF TRANSMITTAL

Evaluation Survey of Israel Participants in the A.I.D. Training Program.

The world-wide evaluation survey of participant training is nearing completion or has been completed in a number of countries. However, the first published country report of survey findings to be received in Washington is that from Israel. This Mission has phased out and for this reason some of the more complex portions of the data analysis have been omitted from the report. Also for this reason, the authors of the report did not draw conclusions or make interpretative suggestions for action based on survey findings. The data on the punch cards, however, are complete and will be incorporated in the regional report. If thought necessary, they may later be independently subjected to more elaborate analysis than that presented in the report.

Readers should be made aware that this survey and report was financed with counterpart funds through joint agreement between the Israeli government and USAID/Israel.

The remainder of this memorandum deals with certain interpretations of findings and suggestions for action which are inherent in the report but were not explicitly drawn by the authors. It is recommended that this portion of the memorandum not be read until at least the summary (first five pages of the report) has been studied.

A.I.D. HISTORICAL AND
TECHNICAL REFERENCE
ROOM 1656 NS

During the course of the interviews, participants were asked to judge their degree of satisfaction with their training programs as these now appeared in retrospect. They were asked to rate their degree of satisfaction on a 4-point scale ranging from "very satisfactory" through "moderately satisfactory," "not too satisfactory," to "not satisfactory at all." A second question asked them to rate the degree of importance they attached to the training experience as they looked back upon it. This was a 3-point scale whose descriptive terms were, "one of the most important things they ever did"; "waste of time"; "somewhere between these two extremes." Although each of these questions measures somewhat different elements of the satisfaction-dissatisfaction mental pattern they also overlap in measuring the same or similar elements as is evidenced by the high statistical significance of the relation between the responses. Thus, 71 percent of those who rated the program as "most important" also said they were "very satisfied while only 44 percent of those who picked the "in between" point on the importance scale were "very satisfied." Conversely, only 29 percent of the participants who felt the program was "most important" were only "moderately" or "not very" satisfied while 56 percent of participants who rated themselves as "in between" on the importance scale also said they were only "moderately" or "not very" satisfied with their training experience. The chi-square relation is 24.3, a figure which indicates a probability of less than 1 in 1000 that the observed distribution of percentages is the result of chance factors.

This mental pattern or "gestalt" of satisfaction-dissatisfaction is of considerable diagnostic value as will be seen in the discussion on pages 29-33 of the Israel report.

One of the most important criteria of successful training is the degree of utilization which returned participants make of their training. There are two aspects of utilization, direct use of the acquired skills and knowledge in job performance and the sharing of skills and knowledge with others. A series of questions in the questionnaire was used to measure both the direct application and dissemination aspects of training utilization. A scoring system was developed by which returned participants could be classified as "high" utilizers versus "medium" or "low" utilizers. Among the high utilizers, 72 percent were "very satisfied" with their training experience as contrasted with 55 percent of those with lower utilization scores. Only 28 percent of the high utilizers rated themselves as less than "very satisfied" with their training compared with 45 percent of the lower utilizers who expressed lower degrees of satisfaction. A similar relation exists between utilization scores and amount of importance attached to the training program. High utilizers were more likely to rate their training programs as high in importance than were those with lower utilization scores. Thus, degree of satisfaction with training is very definitely related to degree of utilization which is a measure of success of training. The Israeli analysts tabulated a number of factors covered in the survey to investigate possible relations with satisfaction. On the basis of these findings, the following suggestions for action can be made,

roughly in order of their importance:

1. Before leaving the home country, participants should be well satisfied with the proposed training program and should be quizzed on this point before departure. If they are not well satisfied, steps should be taken to remove the causes of this pre-departure dissatisfaction. In Israel, 73 percent of those who were well satisfied with their proposed program before leaving were also very well satisfied after their return whereas only 34 percent of those not well satisfied with the pre-departure plans expressed a high degree of satisfaction after coming home.

2. The level of the program should be thoroughly explained prior to departure. Participants who did not have advance knowledge of the level of their program were more likely to be dissatisfied with the training experience after return than were those who did have such advance knowledge.

The Israeli experience showed that those participants who were most likely to be satisfied with the level of their programs were those who had had more than two years experience in their field of specialization at the time they were selected and who took an active part in the planning of their programs.

3. The training program of each participant should be arranged in complete detail before his arrival in the country of training. Participants who discovered on arrival that the details of their programs were only partially arranged or not worked out at all were more likely to be those who would later and after their

return home also be those who would be less satisfied. It is a legitimate inference that the success of training would be enhanced if all project managers or programing agencies responsible for the training of individual participants were required to fully work out the details of each participant's program and supply this detailed program to the US AID mission so each participant can study it before his departure from his home country.

4. Project managers or training advisors should give much individual attention and guidance to arriving participants. In Israel, about 66 percent of those participants who said they had received adequate attention and guidance from their project managers also expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their training experience. In contrast, only about 33 percent of those who felt they had not received enough guidance from their project managers were later well satisfied with their training.

5. Project managers should guard against exposing a participant to a large number and variety of things to do and see during training. Those Israeli participants who said they had to do and see too many things during the course of training were less likely to be well satisfied, in retrospect, than were those who felt their scope of activities was "about right."

6. A reasonable minimum of social activities for every participant should be arranged in the country of training. Those Israeli participants for whom no social activities had been planned

were somewhat less likely to express later satisfaction than were those who did have such activities arranged for them.

7. There is some evidence that length of training time is positively correlated with degree of eventual satisfaction. The small group of Israeli participants who had spent over a year in training contained a relatively higher proportion of "very satisfied" persons than did the group whose training periods were shorter.

There were three other correlates with "satisfaction" but they do not suggest any action. Thus, participants who left for training before 1956 were somewhat more likely to be well satisfied than were those who departed after that year. Age was broadly correlated with satisfaction. Those who were 50 years old or more at the time they left for training were more likely to be "very satisfied" in retrospect than were those in the ages below 50 but there was no difference between the under-50 sub-groups. The third correlate with satisfaction was the major field of activity. The group who received training in health and sanitation contained the highest proportion of "very satisfied" participants. Trainees in public administration ranked next while those who had been involved in "direct military support" ranked lowest in proportion of very satisfied participants.

As has been indicated, satisfaction with the training program is significantly related to utilization of that training. There are, however, some further points to bring out with respect to utilization as measured by the utilization scores.

The level of position at the time of selection was coded according to List I of ICA Manual Order 1363.7, "Fields of Specialization for Individual Participants." The group of participants who were in the next to highest level, namely, "policy makers, executives, and administrators-second level" contained the lowest proportion of high utilization scorers. Engineers (level 4) came next, subordinate management (level 3) ranked slightly higher and the professional group (level 5) contained the largest proportion of high utilization scorers. The "all other" group ranked about the same as the subordinate management class.

In the absence of more controlled analysis, however, it would not be proper to infer that, if high utilization is desired, participants should be selected from the professional and vocational groups while the policy makers and administrators should be eschewed.

Those who did not attend a university during their training and those who did attend and received academic degrees showed almost equally low proportions of high utilization scorers. A little better than one-third of each group were high scorers. On the other hand, well over half of those who attended a school but received a non-academic citation or certificate rather than a degree made high utilization score.

Finally, there is an interesting relation between utilization scores and the field of activity in which training was given. The participants trained in Health and Sanitation showed the highest proportion of high utilization scorers, almost two-thirds of them

scoring 75 or more on a 100 point scale. Transportation ranked next with three-fifths of their group making scores of 75 and up. Education ranked practically as well, the slight difference having no statistical significance. Agriculture and Natural Resources came next with only a little better than two-fifths of these participants scoring in the high utilization range. Public Administration and Industry and Mining had practically the same proportions of high utilization scorers, a bit better than one-third, a bit worse than two-fifths. Lowest of all was the Direct Military Support group of whom only 22 percent made 75 or more points on the utilization scale. Labor, Community Development and other fields of activity had too few participants for the utilization scores to be meaningful.

Although 96 percent of the Israeli participants were satisfied with their training in some degree, 359 of them suggested a total of 741 changes which they thought would be improvements in the programs. There are two measures of the relative importance of these changes. One is the sheer frequency with which a type of change was mentioned. The other is the salience of the change in the minds of the participants. An idea or opinion is said to be psychologically salient when it is to the fore in the cognitive pattern of a response. The question regarding changes in training programs was open-ended and thus permitted a free response. The ideas expressed in these responses were recorded in order of mention and were so coded that this order of mention could be identified

on the punch cards. The first mentioned idea was regarded as the most salient in the participant's thinking as he answered the question.

The type of change most often mentioned was a shift in emphasis meaning, in most cases, more training over a longer period of time. Well over one-fourth of the total number of changes suggested were of this type. This kind of change was also the most salient among the group of participants, being given first mention by almost one-third of them.

Changes in arrangement came next, both in frequency of mention and in salience. These changes involved better planning and organization of the program, more guidance from project managers, a more active part in planning by the participants themselves and better advance information about the program.

Changes in type of programs were only slightly less salient and less frequently mentioned than changes in arrangement. Changes in type refer primarily to an increase in practical, on-the-job kinds of training.

Other kinds of changes than these three accounted for one-fourth of all the changes mentioned but their salience in the group was quite low, indicating that most of them were after-thoughts.